

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/009,022	12/03/2001	Boaz Harari	687-412	5829
75	90 02/06/2004		EXAM	INER
Jeffrey J Hohenshell			PHILOGENE, PEDRO	
AMS Research Corporation 10700 Bren Road West			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Minnetonka, MA 55343		3732	,	
			DATE MAILED: 02/06/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Annti-and/a			
· ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
· Office Action Summan	10/009,022	HARARI ET AL.			
· Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
7	Pedro Philogene	3732			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware	<del>-</del>				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-22,24-63 and 65-78 is/are pending i 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-22,24-62 and 66-78  5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) 63 and 65 is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	g is/are withdrawn from considera	ation.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:				

Art Unit: 3732

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 63,65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pietrzak et al (5,527,342) in view of Sohn (WO/97/47246).

With respect to claims 63,65, Pietrzak et al discloses a detachable tip (10) for a needle comprising a tip (12) having a sharp end and adapted for boring through bone, an extension (16) of the tip apposite of the sharp end and a substantially longer than the sharp tip, attached to a thread (50).

It is noted that Pietrzak et al did not teach of a flexible extension and a sharp end adapted for being grasped by a hollow needle, at a side of the sharp tip opposite of the extension or at a side of the extension; as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Sohn evidences the use of a device with a flexible extension and a sharp end adapted for being grasped by a hollow needle, at a side of the sharp tip opposite of the extension or at a side of the extension to prevent cracking and chipping of bone.

Therefore, given the teaching of Sohn, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Pietrzak et al., as taught by Sohn to prevent cracking and shipping of bone.

## Response to Amendment

Application/Control Number: 10/009,022

,Art Unit: 3732

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 63,65 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, applicant's arguments that no election of species was required in the PCT written opinion is not persuasive, since all of the claims could be searched in a PCT, as long as applicant pays the required fees. Furthermore, applicant stated that on the reliance on the Office Action, applicant originally elected Group IV, which the Office Action said corresponded to claims 62-65. In the last Office Action, Examiner explained to the applicant that claim 62 was inadvertently written in both Group III and Group IV, but claim 62, for obvious reasons, belongs to Group III. Applicant stated that at least one independent generic claim does exist in this case, however, to the examiner's knowledge there is no generic claim in this case.

## Conclusion

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (703) 308-2252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P Shaver can be reached on (703) 308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pedro Philogene February 3, 2004

> PED**RO** PHILOGENE PRIM**ARY** EXAMINER